

**REMARKS**

Claims 1–16 and 18–38 are now pending. Applicants respectfully traverse and request reconsideration.

**Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 103**

Claims 1–16 and 18–38 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 7,184,604 to Mizuno et al. (“Mizuno”). More specifically, the Office Action alleges that Mizuno shows all of the claim limitations except that a handheld device comprises the claimed limitations and that it would be obvious to include the claim limitations in a handheld device.

With regard to claim 8, Mizuno fails to show, teach, or suggest, *inter alia*, a real time direct memory access device coupled to the first memory device and the second memory device and the graphics processor such that the real time direct memory access device provides for direct access to the first memory device and the second memory device.

In the Response to Arguments section, the Examiner states that “the issue of whether Mizuno’s transform block or graphic block 202, which has a direct memory access to the memories 204a–204b, is real time processor is just a design choice ...” and would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art. However, even if the graphic block 202 could be a real time processor as suggested by the Examiner, Mizuno still fails to show all of the discrete elements of the claim. For example, the claim requires, among other things, (1) a first memory device, (2) a second memory device, (3) a graphics processor, and (4) a real time direct memory access device. The Examiner appears to equate the memories 204a–204b to the first and second memory devices and block 202 to the graphics processor. Applicants can find no mention of the fourth element, namely, a real time memory access device coupled to the first memory device and the

second memory device and the graphics processor in the cited portions of Mizuno. Therefore, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claim 8 is respectfully requested.

Claim 19 is allowable for at least similar reasons as claim 8. Claim 19 is also believed to be allowable for having novel and non-obvious subject matter. Therefore, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claim 19 is respectfully requested.

Claims 9 and 20–30 each ultimately depend on claims 8 and 19, respectively, and are allowable for at least similar reasons. Claims 9 and 20–30 are also believed to be allowable for having novel and non-obvious subject matter. Therefore, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 9 and 20–30 is respectfully requested.

With regard to claim 1, Mizuno fails to show, teach, or suggest, inter alia, a first memory device that receives a video input signal from a camera, the video input signal containing an encoded video frame comprising a plurality of portions of encoded video frame data.

The Examiner states that “the issue of whether data is from a processor or a camera does not have any effect on the claimed apparatus.” Applicants respectfully disagree and submit that the claim language cannot be ignored. Applicants claim specifically recites “a first memory device that receives a video input signal from a camera” and therefore the claimed apparatus specifically requires receiving a video input signal from a camera. As noted above, the Examiner appears to equate the memories 204a–204b to the first and second memory devices and block 202 to the graphics processor. However, by this interpretation, the first memory device (204a) of Mizuno receives a portion of encoded frame data sets from the graphics processor (202) and not from a camera as claimed. (See Fig. 37 for example).

The Examiner also states that “Mizuno does mention that the encoded data originally comes from a digital camera (col. 2, l. 1, col. 15, ll. 19–20).” However, even if the encoded data

does originally come from a digital camera as alleged, the first memory device (204a) of Mizuno does not receive it from the digital camera—rather the first memory device (204a) of Mizuno receives any encoded data from the graphics processor (202). Therefore, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claim 1 is respectfully requested.

Claims 10 and 31 are allowable for at least similar reasons as claim 1. Claims 10 and 31 are also believed to be allowable for having novel and non-obvious subject matter. Therefore, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 10 and 31 is respectfully requested.


Claims 2–9, 11–16, 18, and 32–38 each ultimately depend on one of claims 1, 10, and 31 and are allowable for at least similar reasons. Claims 11–16, 18, and 32–38 are also believed to be allowable for having novel and non-obvious subject matter. Therefore, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 11–16, 18, and 32–38 are respectfully requested.

**CONCLUSION**

It is believed that all of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all presently outstanding rejections. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action and the present application is in condition for allowance. Thus, prompt and favorable consideration of this amendment is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (312) 609-7788

Date: July 9, 2008

Respectfully submitted,

By:   
Jimmie K. Tolliver  
Registration No. 62,264

Vedder Price P.C.  
222 N. LaSalle St., Suite 2600  
Chicago, Illinois 60601  
phone: (312) 609-7788  
fax: (312) 609-5005